

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Final Meeting Summary: Session #1
Wednesday, June 20 and Thursday June 21, 2001
Washington State University Tri-Cities Campus, Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met Wednesday, June 20, 2001 from 1:00 pm to 5:30 pm and Thursday, June 21, 2001 from 8:00 am to 9:30 am in rooms 120 and 120A of the Consolidated Information Center on the Washington State University Tri-Cities Campus, Richland, WA.

The purpose of the meeting was two-fold: 1) to welcome Committee members and alternates to the process; and to introduce them to one another, agency staff and facilitators, and 2) to provide the Committee an overview of some of the legal and existing parameters within which they will be making recommendations to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) during the development of a Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Hanford Reach National Monument.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2001

Welcome and Introductions

Greg Hughes, Designated Federal Officer and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members and alternates, the public, and officials and staff from both U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Energy. Mr. Hughes emphasized the opportunity the group has to positively affect the Monument's tremendous human and wildlife resource. He also spoke of the importance of the partnership between the agencies and their role as "joint stewards of the National Monument."

Mr. Hughes introduced Anne Badgley, Director, Pacific Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Keith A. Klein, Manager, Richland Operations Office, U.S. Department of Energy; and Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services, U.S. Department of Energy.

Ms. Badgley and Mr. Klein delivered encouraging and positive opening remarks, welcoming the Committee to its formal role as advisor to the agencies and pledging support for its work. Both indicated that they will give serious consideration to Committee recommendations and will provide feedback to the Committee at various stages throughout the process, indicating how they will use the Committee's advice and where they can not, why.

Ms. Badgley indicated that the two agencies had recently signed a revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that defined the relationship between them. She indicated that this MOU embodies the spirit and approach that the FWS has and looks forward to continuing with DOE.

Mr. Hughes then introduced Alice Shorett and Melanie Emerson, of Triangle Associates, Inc., who will facilitate the Committee's work.

Meeting Overview

Ms. Shorett reviewed the purpose of the meeting and previewed the meeting's ambitious agenda (Attachment A) which would require that the Committee adhere to the times outlined in order to hear all the presentations. She explained the procedure for oral public comment at the end of the meeting and briefly

reviewed the topics to be covered in the Thursday portion of the meeting.

Ms. Shorett asked that each Committee member and alternate introduce him/herself, indicate something that was not evident from the biographies, and express their hopes and expectations for the Committee. In the self-introductions that followed, Committee members and alternates relayed a wide-array of hopes and expectations for their impending work, ranging from specific resource issues to general legal parameters and access. Each member and alternate clarified the interests they represent at the table.

Expectations and Issues Raised by Committee Members and Alternates

- protection of resource
- recreational, scientific and educational access while maintaining natural beauty
- recreation within the context of protection
- land use of areas after Hanford site cleanup
- moving from cleanup of the Hanford sites into stewardship
- find a way to tell the history while maintaining control on the number of visitors
- take the opportunity to put a management system in to enhance the value of the river
- balancing power production with environmental needs and interests
- protection of resource and economic vitality of the area
- protection of sacred grounds
- view management as a process
- adaptive management approach
- recognize and protect the threatened biodiversity of Monument (salmon, shrub steppe)
- recognize the uniqueness of the area from a regional, national and international perspective
- approach management of Monument not as a collection of resources but as a whole system
- take a long-term view of protection to look hundreds of years out, not just our lifetimes

Process Issues Raised by Committee Members and Alternates

- funding for the committee
- process of how the chair and subcommittees will function
- how advice will be taken and used
- what existing and ongoing plans and studies there are and how those will be applied or incorporated into the work of this Committee
- shared information
- address political concerns
- integration of diverse interests
- overcome biases to develop productive ideas
- it is a process; lay groundwork for future issues which will use the guidelines set in this process

After the Committee members and alternates had completed their individual comments, Ms. Shorett briefly previewed the ground rules for the Committee that will apply until formal rules are adopted:

- No personal attacks or characterizations of the other members' opinions
- FWS and DOE are at the meeting to listen
- Committee members to sit at the table and alternates behind
- All members to have an equal opportunity to talk
- Public comment to be taken during the specified time; written comments submitted also to be included in the record of the meeting

Ms. Shorett thanked Gene Schreckhise and the Washington State University for providing excellent meeting space.

Presentations

Following a short break, Ms. Shorett introduced a panel of FWS and DOE staff to make informational presentations on a number of “sideboards” related to management of the Monument. A “sideboard” was defined as the foundation for the Committee work, such as activities identified in the Presidential Proclamation establishing the Monument, the Committee structure as specified in the Charter published in the *Federal Register*, National Wildlife Refuge System conditions, and U.S. Department of Energy considerations as lands are in transition.

Presidential Proclamation and Chronology

Greg Hughes, Project Leader and Designated Federal Officer, described the chronology of events and Service decisions leading up to the establishment and functioning of the Monument. He gave a detailed overview of Presidential Proclamation #7319, June 9, 2000, which established the Monument, and discussed some of the specific existing rights and sideboards as outlined in the Background Paper to the Proclamation. Mr. Hughes explained that the FWS and the Department of Energy signed a supplemental Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as directed by the Secretary of the Interior Memorandum of July 26th to the Director of FWS, and the FWS Director’s Memorandum of September 27th to the FWS Regional Director, Region 1. The Supplemental Amended MOU captured the spirit and intent for FWS and DOE collaboration. It established updated objectives and a philosophical attitude between the DOE and FWS for the management of the Monument and clarified the respective roles and responsibilities for the management of the Hanford Site.

Committee Charter

Paula Call, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Hanford Reach National Monument, discussed in detail the Committee Charter which defines the Committee’s purpose, duration, duties, membership, sub-committees, and authority. Ms. Call stated that before identifying the issues, the Committee should become familiar with 1) existing management directives, 2) actions which are already prohibited or listed as valid existing rights, 3) laws, policies and regulations surrounding the National Wildlife Refuge System, 4) local, regional, national and international cultural significance of resources, and 5) existing land use and studies (including but not limited to the Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Management Plan, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Study and the Counties’ Interim Action Plan). Ms. Call also covered the Charter’s intent to provide an opportunity for meaningful public participation and involvement and asked that the Committee provide advice to FWS in shaping that process.

National Wildlife Refuge System

Carolyn Bohan, Chief of the Pacific Region, National Wildlife Refuge System, FWS, gave a slide presentation on the System. She indicated that the System’s Mission is “to preserve a national network of lands and waters for the conservation and management of fish, wildlife, and plant resources of the United States for the benefit of present and future generations.” She described the System’s resources while showing slides of different aspects of those resources and on-site uses.

Ms. Bohan highlighted the “big six” uses: wildlife observation, wildlife photography, hunting, fishing, environmental education, and interpretation. She discussed the variety of species and habitats in the Pacific Region, which includes Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Hawaii, and the Pacific islands. Ms. Bohan discussed the role of the National Refuge staffs as active land managers employing many different tools, including: water management and level manipulation; prescribed fire; grazing as a viable habitat management tool; agricultural, principally of high energy foods; invasive species management; public use; environmental education; and hunting and fishing. She indicated that the System’s strongest asset is its people and that it relies on volunteers and knowledgeable staff.

U.S. Department of Energy Requirements

Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services, Richland Operations Office, DOE, gave a presentation on Department of Energy requirements related to the National Monument. (Mr. Rosselli's overhead slides can be found as Attachment B.) He first clarified that the DOE's role is secondary to that of the FWS in managing the Monument and that DOE was there to provide support and to help the FWS get the job done. Mr. Rosselli's presentation described several aspects of DOE's current process, including safety, strategy, cost, regulatory considerations, stewardship, history and Indian Nations' relations, and asset disposition (CLUP). Following Mr. Rosselli's presentation there were some questions regarding the boundaries of the Monument and the river corridor.

Tribal Rights and Interests

Scott Aikin, Native American Liaison, FWS, spoke in support of the tribal peoples in the area including the Wanapum, Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and the Nez Perce Tribe. He indicated that FWS works very closely with the tribes and that the Monument and the management of the lands are very important to them. Additionally, he said that the FWS has a responsibility to tribes for government-to-government consultation. He stated that three tribes have ceded rights through signed treaties: the Umatilla, the Nez Perce and the Yakama. He clarified that the Colville Nation is a federally-recognized tribe by way of an Executive Order and that the Wanapum chose not to be federally recognized. He indicated that the Committee should review the Native American Policy of the FWS. Mr. Aikin briefly covered Executive Order 13007, Sacred Rights Access and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.

He indicated that both staff and the Committee should become well acquainted with treaty rights and needs and that there is a direct obligation to keep federally recognized tribes involved and consulted. Mr. Aikin indicated that he would meet with the DOE's tribal liaison Kevin Clark so that they could give advice that is sound and balanced.

Wild and Scenic Interim Protection

Paula Call discussed the Wild and Scenic interim protection status, of the Columbia River Hanford Reach, through public law 100-605, 1988. Initially the river and a quarter-mile corridor on either side of the river were placed in interim protection for 8 years. An amendment to the original law placed the river into indefinite protection status indefinitely. Following designation of the National Monument, the Secretary of the Interior transferred oversight responsibility for Hanford Reach interim protection from the National Parks Service to FWS.

Transmission Lines

Ms. Shorett indicated that a presentation on transmission lines would be provided in a future meeting.

Questions and Responses

Questions were taken from Committee members related to the presentations. Some of the questions were answered directly by the appropriate speaker and others were noted for future discussions on related issues. Ms. Shorett indicated that the presentations in the first meeting of the Committee were not to be taken as exhaustive but as a start on some of the issues and parameters.

Q: What is the definition of sideboards?

R: Parameters; policy, law, regulations and treaties that govern how management recommendations for the Monument may be developed.

Q: Can information and notes related to the Committee be provided on the web?

R: PDF format on the web could be posted as resources are available; DOE offered to provide assistance.

Q: As lands are cleaned up, will they be turned over to become part of the Monument?

R: FWS and DOE need to talk more, but would consider that the Committee would look at those lands and make advice and then DOE would decide what to do as they are in charge of those lands. FWS indicated that they would be looking at those lands for long term protection.

Q: Can we get a definitive map to show the areas that we are talking about?

R: DOE and FWS will work together to provide a good map for everyone, in consultation with the Committee as to it needs to show. In the interim, Committee members received two 1:100,000 Surface Ownership maps.

Q: Will the Committee's advice be used?

R: The Committee's advice is real. FWS and DOE commit to seriously consider it. They will be looking at the sideboards to ensure that the advice provided by the Committee can legally be implemented. The Committee's advice will help FWS craft the best plan for the future of this site. If FWS and DOE take the advice they have committed to explain how it will be used and if they don't, they will explain why not. According to the design of the Committee's process, the Committee will be giving advice to decision-makers throughout the process, not just at the end.

Q: Who picks the experts?

R: Committee members recommend experts and they will be approved as panels by the Committee Chair and the DFO, with guidance from the Facilitator.

Q: Is the list of previous planning efforts ready?

R: This will be put together for the Committee.

Q: Can applicable information be available in one place rather than distributing 26 copies?

R: One single location will be designated.

Q: Is it a foregone conclusion that the plan will be modeled after a typical CCP?

R: In subsequent meetings a full conversation will take place to really delve into what the process is and where it's going. It seems like the answer is yes but we can look at other models to see the entire scope.

Q: What is the funding for this Committee:

R: Lack of funding is not an option. FWS commits to have to look at other planning processes to bring together to define a plan if necessary. FWS has enough money to operate the Committee for the remainder of the fiscal year—we do not know what next year's budget will provide.

FACA Primer

Tim Murphy, Attorney-Advisor, General Law Division, Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, gave a presentation on the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) which primarily defines the procedures by which Federal Advisory Committees function. Mr. Murphy described the background to FACA and its passage in 1972 to regulate numerous groups providing advice to the federal government. (Mr. Murphy's Powerpoint slides can be found as Attachment C.) He covered FACA requirements governing:

1. establishment of the committee through the Presidential Proclamation and the letter from the Secretary of the Interior;
2. public participation which requires that public written comments be accepted at each meeting and

- that, time-permitting, oral comments can be heard as well;
3. the role of the committee to give advice and recommendations: the Committee's role is clearly defined as not performing any work but providing advice and recommendations;
 4. the role of the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) to call, attend and adjourn all Committee meetings as well as approve meeting agendas;
 5. sub-committee definitions, and
 6. failure to comply with the law.

The advice and recommendations of the Committee is then transmitted via the DFO to the appropriate agency. Mr. Murphy stated that the Committee, in a representative capacity, is aiding federal employees perform their function. They are responsible for acting in the public's interest and therefore, if recommendations are contrary to the public interest, those recommendations cannot be accepted.

He discussed the public announcement requirements of the law requiring that a meeting notice be published in the *Federal Register*. He suggested publication of a notice in local papers as a more direct method of notifying the public of the meeting, but stated that it is not required. Detailed minutes of the meetings need to be taken and available for the public and committee to read. Eventually, these are filed in the Library of Congress. Mr. Murphy clarified that the public participation requirement does not apply to subcommittees as they cannot give advice. He indicated that subcommittee members can be alternates from the Committee as well as non-committee members. Mr. Murphy stated that subcommittee deliberations are Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) applicable.

Questions and Answers

Questions were raised as to the absenteeism rule within FACA. Mr. Murphy clarified that the Committee Charter clearly states rules for absenteeism of Committee members and provides a mechanism for replacing them. Mr. Murphy was asked if the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to disband or terminate the Committee. He responded that he would find a concrete answer to that question and get back to the Committee. Another question was raised as to whether certain committee charters had not been renewed and why. Mr. Murphy indicated that he wasn't aware of the historical facts needed to respond. Mr. Murphy responded to a question regarding indemnification for actions taken as part of the Committee by stating that since the Committee is only providing advice and not engaging in actions, that the limitation should not give rise to anything that requires indemnification. Committee members asked Mr. Murphy how they go about bringing consultants on board. Ms. Shorett responded that Triangle Associates, Inc.'s contract has provisions to pay for consultants.

Public Comment

Public comment was made by three individuals in the following order: Dave Goeke, Reg Smart, and Jim Curdy.

Dave Goeke

He said he had been greatly involved for 6-7 years and was formerly Leader of the Monument. He said that he hasn't lost his passion for the place and he congratulated everyone in taking the time to be on the Committee. He urged the members not to reinvent the wheel and indicated that a large amount of information, already existing from prior public processes, should be taken into consideration. They included the Hanford Future Site Uses in 1992, the Hanford Reach EIS process and preferred alternatives, the Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Management Plan (CLUP) and its Resource Inventory, the Arid Lands Ecology Reserve Comprehensive Conservation Plan, Interim Action Plan, and related political debate and public

hearings.

Reg Smart

He stated his concern that politics were not addressed by those at the table and asked what are the ways in which forces in Washington, D.C. could jeopardize the future of the Reach. He said that he himself has done a lot of naive lobbying and he doesn't want to do that anymore. He said that federal employees can't go on record.

Jim Curdy

He asked if the rules of the Proclamation extend beyond the area identified to where it will affect private areas. He stated that when the land was loaned to the Atomic Energy Commission during the bomb construction there was a legal agreement signed to return the land. He said that he would be glad to provide a presentation on the Columbia River Basin Project and how it was started. He stated that the federal government owes lots of money to affected farmers in the area and explained the amount that farmers have to pay out at the beginning of each year for developed lands. He said that the FWS should reconsider repayment to farmers in Adams, Grant and Franklin counties. He asked if the rules and regulations are going to force the removal of the transmission facilities, and stated that he was involved in the negotiations to get no impact on exiting transmission facilities stated in the Proclamation. Mr. Curdy asked that the Committee think of the farmers as it develops its recommendations.

Following Mr. Curdy's comments, Ms. Shorett asked that each Committee member give a brief statement reflecting how s/he felt regarding the day's events. The general atmosphere of the comments was positive and collaborative. Many members commented on their hope to maintain that atmosphere. Mr. Hughes adjourned the meeting at 5:30 pm.

THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2001

After Greg Hughes, DFO, formally opened the meeting, Alice Shorett, facilitator, conducted an overview of the draft ground rules as distributed to Committee members and alternates the previous day. Many questions were raised during the discussion. Ms. Shorett explained that action on ground rules was to be taken at the next meeting.

Draft Ground Rules Discussion

Ms. Shorett opened the discussion by indicating that through Triangle's interviews with Committee members and alternates it was evident that the Committee had a wide range of experience on consensus-based committees. The Committee generally felt that the more agreement that can be reached, the stronger the advice to the decision-makers.

The Committee reviewed the draft ground rules distributed on the Wednesday, June 20th and discussed changes to those ground rules and procedural questions. Suggested changes to the draft ground rules included:

- Defining a procedure for electing a Committee Chair and a Vice Chair, if applicable
- Stating whether the Chair votes or simply breaks ties within the Committee
- Clarifying that subcommittee work can include non-members and alternates
- Stating that alternates will sit at the table when members are not present
- Stating that alternates cannot be the Committee Chair
- Developing a strong system of reaching out to alternates; two potential mechanisms were through subcommittees and through collaboration with the members to raise issues
- Indicating whether subcommittees require a Committee member's participation
- Stating that all members need to be assured of time to speak
- Defining a unified way of working with the media, either through the Committee Chair or the DFO
- Clarifying how the Committee will include the public comment/input into the process
- Adding "The *only* purpose of the Committee..." to the first paragraph of the ground rules
- Strengthening the 4th bullet under Roles and Responsibilities of the Committee Advisory Members to emphasize the Committee member's responsibility to engage their constituency
- Including in the ground rules a statement about the Committee's role in broader public education
- Stating that meeting summaries will be sent out in draft form to the Committee within one week of the session and then formally finalized at the next in-person session
- Defining where final meeting summaries will be posted on the Web for easy access
- Defining whether the Committee will run by parliamentary rules

Ms. Shorett clarified for purposes of interaction with the media that at the end of every session, Committee members will take away an official paragraph that can be used to speak from. That statement will address the formal position of the Committee. If the press asks specific questions, members will speak only for him/herself or for their constituents; members cannot characterize other people's positions or comments.

Many questions were raised and discussed regarding subcommittees and their formation. It was suggested that other groups already working on certain topics be brought in as subcommittees so that work is not doubled. It was clarified that subcommittees are convened based on the Committee's direction to accomplish work and move the Committee's own work along with needed information.

The Committee suggested that some political representatives and/or their aids be kept informed about the Committee's work and progress through brief meetings as well as a tour of the Monument. The Committee was concerned about potentially creating internal political divisiveness and requested that a neutral make contacts on behalf of the Committee to minimize that concern.

The Committee discussed its interest in reaching consensus as much as possible but recognized that consensus may not always occur. When consensus does not occur, other opinions would be included as alternatives. During this discussion a suggestion was made regarding setting priorities and ranking preferences.

Qualities and Criteria for Selection of a Committee Chair

The Committee reviewed a list of desirable qualities in a chairperson that was developed based on the interviews with members and alternates. The following list was displayed as an overhead and augmented by Committee members:

- objectivity; neutrality
- ability to run meetings; sticks to agenda
- leadership: keeps group focused on objective
- fairness and integrity
- diplomacy
- ability to diffuse conflict and not get personal while addressing issues
- encourages collaboration among members
- listens and communicates clearly
- interpreter of what people are saying; ability to translate the different “languages” Committee members speak
- respect and credibility
- no strong special-interest ties
- ability to work with the DFO and the Facilitator

Roles of the Committee Chair, DFO and Facilitator

The question was raised of what specifically the roles of the facilitator and the Chair would be once the Chair had been selected. Ms. Shorett and Committee members responded by clarifying that the facilitator and the Chair would work in partnership. Often the Chair directs meetings but the facilitator runs sessions and acts as a shuttler between members. The facilitators are responsible for completing the products for the Committee and generally supporting Committee work. Both should remain neutral and acceptable to the full Committee. It would be a three-part team: the DFO, the facilitator and the Chair. Generally, the Chair would preside over the meetings, take care of general business and call votes. The leadership of the Chair would be an effective tool to keep the group focused and on track. The facilitator would run discussions and act as staff to the Chair. Additionally, the Chair would also help plan subsequent sessions. It was noted that the agenda for the subsequent meeting would be set by the Committee at the current meeting and the detail would be worked out by the three-part team. The DFO officially opens and closes the meetings, approves the agenda and is in attendance at each meeting.

Public Comment

Public comment was made by two individuals in the following order: Robert Burco and Sally Simmons

Robert Burco

He stated that he has had a lot of experience working with the National Parks Service and other agencies on access to natural resources. He noted that the most successful interactions in his experience came from the opportunity of citizens to directly interact with politicians and in this case Committee members; because some people feel more comfortable expressing their concerns and interests in a more informal setting. Mr Burco suggested that such an opportunity for interaction be arranged for the public and other groups, with the Committee.

Sally Simmons

Ms. Simmons stated that she was a professor at the Washington State University and that she was interested in helping the Committee. She said her expertise is in the botany of shrub-steppe terrain.

Next meeting

Triangle Associates, Inc. committed to distribute via email the most likely meeting dates for the next Committee session.

Topics of Committee business to be covered at the next meeting would include selection of a Chair and potentially a Vice Chair, completion of Committee ground rules, organization of the Committee, definition of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan, and identification key decision points at which the decision-makers would be involved. Greg Hughes adjourned the meeting and invited Committee members and alternates on an informational tour of the Monument grounds.

Certified by

Greg Hughes, Designated Federal Official

Jim Watts, Chair

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

<u>Committee Seat</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
K- 12 Education:	Karen Wieda	Royace Aikin
Cities	Chris Jensen ‡	Bob Thompson
Conservation/Environmental	Rich Leaumont	Mike Lilga
Counties	Leo Bowman	Frank Brock
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	Mike Wiemers
Public-at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic	Michele Gerber	Eric Gerber
	Gene Schreckhise	Ed Rykiel
	David Geist	Dennis Dauble
State	Jeff Tayer	Ron Skinnarland
Tribal	Robert Tomanawash ‡	Rex Buck
Utilities/Irrigation		Nancy Craig
Designated Federal Officer	Greg Hughes	

Participants and Invited Speakers

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Anne Badgley, Director, Pacific Region ‡
U.S. Department of Energy	Keith A. Klein, Manager, Richland Operations Office ‡
U.S. Department of Energy	Bob Rosselli, Deputy Manager for Business Services
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Paula Call, Outdoor Recreation Planner
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Carolyn Bohan, Chief, Pacific Region National Wildlife Refuge System ‡
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Scott Aikin, Native American Liaison ‡
U.S. Department of the Interior	Timothy Murphy, Attorney-Advisor, General Law Division, Office of the Solicitor ‡

Facilitators

Triangle Associates, Inc.	Alice Shorett	Melanie Emerson
---------------------------	---------------	-----------------

Observers

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Don Voros ‡ Susan Saul David Gonzales ‡	Mike Marxen Heidi Brunkal ‡
U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward	James Zeisloft
Tri-Cities Herald	John Stang	
Public	Robert Burco Dave Goeke Terri Traub ‡ Mary Hollen, BPA ‡ RW Shallman ‡	Jim Curdy ‡ Bill Erickson, BPA ‡ Adam Fyall Reg Smart ‡ Sally Simmons

‡ - denotes attendance only on Wednesday, June 20, 2001

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Triangle Associates, Inc., Facilitators

Suggested Meeting Process, Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee (June, 2001)

Draft Groundrules, Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee (June, 2001)

Common Information Base, Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee (June, 2001)

Issues raised during interviews and draft groundrules (memo) (June, 2001)

Member/Alternate Availability, Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee (June, 2001)

US Fish and Wildlife Service

The National Wildlife Refuge System: Promises for a New Century

Chronology of Events and Service Decisions Relating to Saddle Mountain National Wildlife Refuge and the Department of Energy Hanford Site (June, 2001)

Interim Management Guide Memorandum from Secretary Babbitt (July, 2000)

First Amended Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office for the Operation of the Fitzner-Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve at the Hanford Site; Fourth Amendment to the Wahluke Slope Permit (June, 2001)

The Native American Policy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, Joint Resolution of Congress

Maps and Itinerary

National Wildlife Refuges: A Visitor's Guide (map) (revised 8/98)

FEALE Unit, Saddle Mountain Unit, Wahluke Unit (map) (1999)

Hanford Reach National Monument: Management Areas (map)

Richland Quadrangle Washington (map) (U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 1978)

Priest Rapids Washington (map) (U.S. Bureau of Land Management, 1979)

FACA Field Trip, Hanford Reach National Monument (itinerary) (June, 2001)

US Department of the Interior, Solicitor General's Office

Federal Advisory Committee Act (Powerpoint slides)

US Department of Energy

Working with Indian Tribal Nations (December, 2000)

Executive Order 13007: Indian Sacred Sites (1996)

American Indian & Alaska Native Tribal Government Policy (October, 2000)

Hanford 2012: Accelerating Cleanup and Shrinking the Site (letter) (January, 2001)

Hanford 2012: Accelerating Cleanup and Shrinking the Site; Restore the Corridor (January, 2001)

Hanford 2012: Accelerating Cleanup and Shrinking the Site; The Central Plateau (January, 2001)

Hanford 2012: Accelerating Cleanup and Shrinking the Site; The Future (January, 2001)

Summary of the Hanford Site: Environmental Report 1999

Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Advisory Committee DOE Requirements (June, 2001)
(overheads)